

CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS, IV¹

36. BGU II 539 and 608

It was noted in *CSBE* 34 n.10 that almost all known examples of indictions numbered 16 belonged to the beginning either of the second (327-342) or third (342-357) cycles of indictions, being equivalent to the first indiction of the new cycle in the latter case (342/3), which accounted for most of the instances. Only *BGU* IV 1092 belongs to the cycle of 372. One exception to the pattern of fourth-century distribution was noted, *BGU* II 539, a list of payments and arrears of wheat taxes dated by the editor "aus arabischer Zeit." This remarkable exception to the normal pattern awakens suspicion of itself. The suspicion is increased when one notices that *BGU* II 608, also dated "aus arabischer Zeit," is stated by Krebs to be in the same hand as 539. *BGU* 608, however, is a list of men from the village of Karanis (in i.1, the restoration $\beta\rho\epsilon[v\iota]\omega\nu$ [*l. βρέουιον*] ἀνδρ(ων) imposes itself in spite of *BL* I 56), presumably detailed for some liturgical duty. Now it is well-known that the last century to produce any quantity of Karanidian documents is the fourth; and *P. Haun.* inv. 318, of A.D. 439, is the last known text from the village. A text from the Arab period from Karanis, therefore, is unlikely; and the names which one finds in the two *BGU* texts are strongly reminiscent of the nomenclature of the fourth-century papyri from Karanis. Scarcely any of them, in fact, can be found in papyri of the seventh and eighth centuries. We suggest, therefore, that both texts are to be dated to the fourth century, and in all probability to *ca* 342.

¹ For the purpose of this series, see *BASP* 15 (1978) 233. Besides standard abbreviations, we cite our own works by the following: *CSBE* = *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (Stud. Amst. 8, Zutphen 1978); *RFBE* = *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* (*BASP* Suppl. 2, Missoula 1979); *CNBD* = "Chronological Notes on Byzantine Documents" (the present series of notes), in *BASP* 15 (1978) and following.

Dr. G. Poethke, asked if the dating to the Arab period was palaeographically certain, replies "Hände zeigen Ähnlichkeiten, sind wohl nicht dieselben. Datierung schwierig, jedoch würde man die Texte auf den ersten Blick nicht der 'arabischer Zeit' zuweisen." [After this article was in press we saw D. Bonneau's article, "Un règlement de l'usage de l'eau au V^e siècle," *Hommages Serge Sauneron II: Egypte post-pharaonique* (Bibl. d'Etude 82, Cairo 1979). On p. 15 (and nn. 1–2) she deals with BGU 608, which she thinks is "bien plus tardive" than the fourth century, a view we cannot agree with. In n. 2 she restores line 1 as βρε[ο'υ'(ιον) τ]ῶν ἀνδρ(ων) (*sic*); the article is not necessary and the abbreviation seems also out of place.]

37. BGU III 858

This text is a receipt for a payment of five thousand drachmas, dated to years 12–11–4 of the first tetrarchy, Phaophi 13. This date was given by Krebs as 10.x.294, but rightly corrected by Preisigke in BL I 74 to 11.x.295. The first line of the papyrus, which has no apparent relationship to what follows, was transcribed by the editor as follows: Πουκω καὶ Εἰ... λείνω πα.ρ.[.]. In BL I 74, the correction printed on p. 7 of BGU III is recorded, that the beginning of the line should read Τρυκω. No suggestion about the sense of this peculiar line was made.

Documents after the creation of the tetrarchy commonly have consular dates at the beginning or the end, and in the first few decades of consular dating the combination of a consular date with a regnal one is not uncommon. We ought therefore to seek a consular date for the first line of BGU 858. The consuls of A.D. 295 were Nummius Tuscus and C. Annius Anullinus; one of the known forms of their dating clause is Τούσκω καὶ Ἀνουλλίνω ὑπάτοις.² At our request, Dr. G. Poethke has examined the papyrus, and on the basis of the information provided by him we propose the reading Τού[σ]κω καὶ Ἀν[ο]υλείνω ὑπάτο[ρ]ις[.].

38. P.Lips. 23

The editors present the consular date at the beginning of this papyrus as follows:

ὑπατείας [τοῦ] δεσπότης ἡ[μῶν Φλ. -]
 ανοῦ τοῦ [αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου τὸ .]
 [καὶ] [... τοῦ λαμπ-]
 ροτ[άτου κτλ.]

2 See CSBE 104 a. 295; we are dealing of course with a transliteration of the names in the ablative in Latin rather than the normal translation into the genitive or dative; cf. S. F. Johanson, *Proc. XIV Int. Congr. Pap.* 183–88.

The papyrus belongs to the Fl. Isidoros group, which spreads over the years 368 (*P.Lips.* 33) to 389 (*P.Lips.* 37). It is dated (line 29) to Thoth 27 = 24 September, and it mentions a fourth new indiction, which could be 375/6 or 390/1, as being future (cf. *CSBE* 31). Now 374 was the consulate of Gratianus III and Fl. Equitius, while 390 was that of Valentinianus IV and Fl. Neoterius. These are the only consulates in proximity which can be considered. Of them, however, the consuls of 390 can be excluded, because at 24 September 390, the fourth new indiction would no longer be future but present. The consuls of 389, on the other hand, are not suitable (no emperor involved). We conclude, therefore, that one must restore as follows and date to 24.ix.374:

ὑπατείας [τοῦ] δεσπότου ἡ[μῶν Φλ(αουίου) Γρατι-]
 ανοῦ τοῦ [αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου τὸ γ']
 [καὶ] Φλ(αουίου) Ἐκυ[τίου τοῦ λαμπ-]
 ροτ[άτου κτλ.]

The alternative date in *CSBE* 31 to A.D. 389 should thus be deleted.

39. *P.Lips.* 42

The presence in line 2 of this papyrus of the title ἀποεπάρχου with reference to the second consul makes it necessary to recognize there the consuls of A.D. 391, Fl. Tatianus and Fl. Symmachus, whose normal titulature in other papyri is as follows: Φλαουίου Τατιανοῦ τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἐπάρχου τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραιτωρίου καὶ Φλαουίου Συμμάχου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἀποεπάρχου (see *CSBE* 115 a.391). The remains of the two copies of *P.Lips.* 42 preserve virtually all of this except the consuls' names. The papyrus must be dated therefore to iii–iv.391 and becomes the earliest published example of the current consuls in that year.

40. *P.Lond.* III 991 (p. 258)

The consular formula of this text is presented as follows in the original publication: [ὑπατείας]λείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθη-
 σομένου Παῦνη κη τῇ[ς ἰνδ()]. The editor dates the papyrus simply "sixth century" without discussion. In the index, however, we find (p. 337), [ὑπατείας (?) Φλαυίου Βασι]λείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθη-
 σομένου (qu. A.D. 542?). The consulate of Fl. Basilus was 541; since the indiction number is lost in line 1, it is difficult to see why 542 is suggested. Neither 541 nor 542, however, is possible, for two reasons: (1) the phrase καὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθησομένου is never used with Fl. Basilus cos. 541, nor indeed with any consul after A.D. 500. It is strictly a fifth-century phenomenon.³ (2) The text seems to come from the Thebaid, as the editor

³ See *CNBD* VI 63 for a detailed discussion.

remarks on the basis of the fact that one of the parties comes from Hermonthis. No document from any part of the Thebaid (i.e. Hermopolis and all to the south) uses the epithet λαμπρότατος for Fl. Basilius cos. 541, who is uniformly called ἐνδοξότατος in this part of the country.⁴

There was, however, another Basilius who served as consul, namely Fl. Caecina Decimus Maximus Basilius, cos. 480. Like the other Basilius, he had no colleague, but it was evidently at one time expected that one would later be announced. There is, however, no mention of a colleague or the expectation of one in *BGU XII* 2155.2. This papyrus, the sole other attestation of this consulate, also gives Basilius the epithet λαμπρότατος.

P.Lond. III 991 therefore seems to refer to the consul of 480. But we know that as late as 27.iii.481 (*P.Princ.* II 82) Egyptian scribes were dating by the postconsulate of Zeno III, i.e. the consul of 479. *BGU XII* 2155, of 18 October, refers to Basilius as consul, but the editor has properly described this as an error for postconsulate, natural enough if his consulate *per se* had never been in use in the country. The scribe might be pardoned for believing that the newly-announced name meant the consul of the current year. *P.Lond.* III 991, falling on Pauni 28 = 22 June, must also belong to 481 and provide the earliest evidence so far attested of the knowledge of Basilius' consulate in Egypt. We therefore restore line 1 as follows: [μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ(αουλίου) Βασι]λείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθισομένου. The length obtained for the restoration is about 21 or 22 letters. In line 23, the only one certainly restorable, 21 letters are missing; in line 2, if Αὐρήλιοι were written out instead of abbreviated, one would have 22 letters.

41. *P.Lond.* V 1719

In the course of arguing that *P.Vindob.inv.G.* 25948 was to be dated in September, 541, we cited two examples of the supposed knowledge of the consulate of Fl. Basilius in early 541 in Egypt (see *ZPE* 28 [1978] 229 n. 22). We later realized (as James G. Keenan has pointed out to us) that one of these (*P.Cair.Masp.* II 67126) is not Egyptian at all, but was written in Constantinople, while the other one is doubtfully dated, namely *P.Lond.* V 1719 from Thebes. The editor assigned the text to the consulate of Basilius (541), but expressed some doubt; he opted for 541 rather than 556 (which is also a fourth indiction) because he considered the room in line 1 insufficient for μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν. Keenan points out to us, however, that the papyrus is broken off at the top, and that nothing prevents the assumption that a postconsulate, perhaps preceded by a regnal date, stood on one or more

4 We treat this question in *CNBD* III 35.

now-lost lines. Given the difficulty of a consular date by Basilius in Egypt in January-February 541, 556 seems to us inevitable.

42. *P.Med.inv.* 27

This papyrus is published by S. Daris in *ZPE* 23 (1976) 217–18 for the sake of the consular formula, which is printed as follows:

[ὕπατέας Γρατιά]ρου τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου υἱοῦ τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμ[ῶν
Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ Αὐγούστου καὶ Δαγαλαίφου]
τοῦ λαμπροτάτου στρ[ατηλάτου]

The text mentions, however, the 11th indiction. This indiction is 367/8. It seems most likely that this forms part of the title of an official (if one considers the mention of Alexandria in line 5), and it does not seem very likely that the officials for 367/8 would already have been functioning in 366 (as the editor considered the most likely date to be). It therefore seems to us much more likely that we should restore the date as a postconsulate. As most of the piece is lost, no conclusion about the length of the lacuna is otherwise possible.

43. *P.Mich.* XIII 660

In *CSBE* 62 n. 65 we commented on the problem posed by lines 9–10 of this papyrus, in which the editor's text gives εἰς τὰς τελευταίας ἡμέρας τοῦ παρελθόντος μηνὸς Μεσορῆ τῆς φ[θιν]οῦσης ἐβδόμης ἡ[δ]ικτ[ι]ο[ς], which he translates, "in the last days of the passed month Mesore of the seventh indiction which is coming to its end." The usage of φθίνουσα in combination with either ἡνδικτίων or ἐπινέμησις is unparalleled, and it suggests that the indiction which was going on in Mesore was still going on in Thoth but about to come to an end; this is contrary to everything we know of the indiction system. Now in line 15 there is a reference to Phaophi 8 τῆς παρελθούσης ἡ[δ]ικτ[ι]οῦς ἐπινεμήσεως. Indiction 6 thus at least is past. Since the reading of the phi in line 10 is certain (as we have verified from a photograph), a word with that beginning must be restored. It seems to us considerably more attractive to restore φ[θαν]οῦσης, which is attested as meaning "past" or "previous" (cf. *LSJ* s.v. φθάνω II.1 and Julian, *Epist.* 73 Bidez).

This restoration, however, does not solve the problem posed by the seeming suggestion that the indiction which included Mesore immediately past was different from the indiction in which the document was drawn up, for in this part of Egypt one would expect an indictional reckoning beginning with Pachon or May. We cannot say whether Constantinopolitan usage affected this text in some way, or whether the implication that Mesore was the immediately preceding month is incorrect.

44. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1997

The editors print as the date of this receipt for the taxes of indiction 4 the following: ἐγράφ(η) Μεσορῆ ζ̄ ἰνδ(ικ.) γ υ̅[π]ἐρ[τῆς ? τ]ετάρτης (line 4). The mention of the indiction for which the taxes were paid has already been made in lines 2–3, and it is puzzling that it recurs in the dating formula. On the basis of a photograph kindly provided by Dr. D. Hagedorn, we believe that we can read a formula more normal for Oxyrhynchos (cf. *CSBE* 21,26): Μεσορῆ ζ̄ ἰνδ(ικτιονος) γ ἀρ[χ(ῆ) τῆς τ]ετάρτης. The text thus belongs to that class dated first by the Thoth to Mesore indictional reckoning normal in Oxyrhynchos and secondly by the beginning of the July (*delegatio*) indiction.

45. *P.Oxy.* XLIV 3204

The consular date of this deed of surety of 2.i.588 (cf. *ZPE* 26 [1977] 284 and *CSBE* 127), following the regnal formula, differs from what is normal for Mauricius in Oxyrhynchos (for which see *RFBE* 58, formula 3) in (a) preceding ὑπατείας with καί, and (b) omitting before ἡμῶν the adjective εὐσεβεστάτου. As the first of these rests on restoration, and the second is mostly restored, one may naturally question the appropriateness of printing a deviation from the standard phrase. We have asked Dr. John Rea to examine the original for the possibility of reading εὐσε]β(εστάτου), and he reports that “the trace before ἡμῶν is very much like the zig-zag mark of abbreviation that is so often found in εὐσεβS. Before that the trace is very meagre, too slight to confirm beta, but εὐσε]βS seems to me very likely to be right.” The restoration of the standard phrase is a bit longer than line 2, but, as Rea points out, the initial phi in line 2 may well have been large. We therefore restore line 3 as follows:

[ὑπατ(ε)ίας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσε]β(εστάτου) ἡμῶν κτλ.

46. *P.Ryl.* IV 616

This taxation list of the province of Augusta Iovia is dated by the editor to ca A.D. 312. The basis on which this date was assigned is Column ii.12–13, where we find the following text:

Ἰνδικτιόνος τοῦ ἐνεστ[ῶτος] κανόνος ὑπ[ατεί]ας τῶν δεσποτῶν
ἡμ[ῶν] Κωνστα[ντίνου καὶ] Λικιννίου[υ] Σ[εβασ]τ[ῶν] α (ἐτους).

About this, the editor comments, “the only year in which a consulate of Constantine and Licinius coincides with the first year of an indiction cycle is 312.”

This dating raises a number of problems: (1) the indiction cycle was not, so far as our evidence goes, introduced into Egypt until late 313 or

early 314, after the death of Maximinus Daia, and year 1 was therefore never "present" (cf. *CSBE* 3–5). (2) The consulate of Constantine and Licinius in 312 was their second one; we would have to assume that the numeral was omitted, which is not unknown (cf. *CNBD* II 15), but which is uncommon and not to be expected with a scribe of high caliber and station. (3) The interpretation by which the numeral of the indiction is separated from that word by an entire consular phrase rests on no parallel; indictional dates after 312 are always closely accompanied by the number. (4) One would naturally take any numeral written immediately after a consulate to refer to the number of the consulate, as is universally the case elsewhere. (5) An excellent photograph kindly provided by the John Rylands Library shows that in line 13 the lacuna after the dotted tau has room for four letters (corresponding to part of pi and the four following letters in the preceding line in $\upsilon\pi[\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}]\alpha\varsigma$). The $\tau[\omega\nu]$ of the editor still leaves sufficient room for two more letters before α ($\xi\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$), which is actually $\alpha\varsigma/$.

Combining these circumstances, we consider a restoration in line 13 of $\eta\mu[\acute{\omega}\nu] \text{ Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Λικιννίου}[\nu] \Sigma[\epsilon\beta\alpha\sigma]\tau[\acute{\omega}\nu \tau\omicron] \alpha\varsigma/$ virtually inescapable. Now the first consulate of Constantine and Licinius fell in 309, during a period when there were both numbered indictions with the regnal year number and also phrases such as we find in *P. Ryl.* 616. We suppose that *P. Ryl.* 616 was written in or after 309; if, as J. D. Thomas has argued (*BASP* 15 [1978] 133–45) and we believe, the tax assessment was issued in May or June at this time, the assessment of the consulate would be "present" or current from May or June of that julian year until the same time the following year. It is possible, since the writer of our papyrus speaks of the canon and not the consulate as present, that we should draw the conclusion that the text is to be dated in the first five or six months of 310, but that cannot be regarded as certain.

A date of 309–310 for *P. Ryl.* 616 may encounter some questions, and it will be as well to face those which occur to us here. (1) Is it not peculiar to find $\tau\omicron \alpha\varsigma/$ with a first consulate, when there was at the time no certainty that a second one would follow? It is, indeed, not the rule at this period, but there is one clear example in 307, just two years earlier, namely *P. Thead.* 10 = *P. Sakaon* 64 (we have verified the reading on a photograph in Brussels). (2) The consular formula is not that normal for 309, if compared with other papyri of that year, since both wording and order are different, whereas they correspond well enough to the formula for 312. This is the most serious objection in our eyes; the standard formula speaks of Licinius Augustus and Constantinus filius Augustorum, in that order. Such a reversal of order is indeed surprising; we cannot cite another example. On the other hand, A. Chastagnol has chronicled the numerous vagaries in the Egyptian evidence produced by the shifting relationships of Constantine and Licinius to the eastern emperors in this period, and if the date is indeed

310 and not the year of the consulate, the reversal of order and change of titles may not be impossible.⁵ It is regrettable that no regnal titulature is attested in the papyri between September–October 309, when Constantine was still called a Caesar, and June, 314, by which time he was the senior Augustus (cf. *RFBE* 33–37). (3) What becomes of the role of *P.Ryl.* 616 in the evidence for the price of gold in this period if its date is shifted? If one considers the table in *P.Oxy.* XLIII, p. 81, one sees that there is no absolutely dated price between the 60,000 den. per pound in A.D. 300 (*P.Panop. Beatty* 2.216) and the 432,000 den. per pound paid on the open market in A.D. 316–318 (*P.Oxy.* XLIII 3121). The price of 100,000 in *P.Oxy.* XVII 2106.20 is only approximately and vaguely dated to *ca* A.D. 304–306. A date of 310 for *P.Ryl.* 616, with its figure of just under 110,000 for an official use, is in no way incompatible with the other evidence.

In sum, we consider that none of the objections to a date in 309 or early 310 is sufficient to overcome the weighty considerations in favor of such a date as set forth above.

47. Dates in *P.Sakaon*

G. M. Parássoglou's recent welcome reedition of the texts of the fourth-century Theadelphia archives contains a number of minor errors in the computation of dates, many of them no doubt typing errors, which we take this opportunity to correct:

<i>Text</i>	<i>Ed. date</i>	<i>Correct date</i>
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 15.29	25.ii.308	26.ii.308
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 16.3	19.iii.309	29.iii.309
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 18	29–30.iv.312	28–29.iv.312
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 21.10	29.xii.319	30.xii.319
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 7.15	26.viii.320	23.viii.320 ⁶
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 22	5–12.ix.324	5–8.ix.324
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 51	7.v.324	6.v.324
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 23	25.xii.324	24.xii.324
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 24	29.vi.325	28.vi.325
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 25.10	29.viii.327	30.viii.327
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 25.19,32	11.ix.327	12.ix.327
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 43	6.xi.327	7.xi.327
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 65	12.ix.328	11.ix.328
<i>P.Sakaon</i> 73	29.ix.328	28.ix.328

⁵ See A. Chastagnol, "La datation par années régnales égyptiennes à l'époque Constantinienne," *Aiôn: Le temps chez les Romains*, ed. R. Chevallier (Caesarodunum 10 bis, Paris 1976) 221–38 at pp. 224–25. A more complete table of regnal dates than Chastagnol's appears in *RFBE*.

⁶ See *CSBE* 108 s.a. 320 for the correct reading of the date (in *P.Thead.* 28).

48. *P.Sakaon* 19.41 = *P.Thead.* 29.39

The month date in Pachon in this line was read as theta by Jouguet, zeta by Parássoglou, and rendered therefore as 4 or 2 May. In fact we see on a photograph provided by J. Bingen that the numeral is clearly ς , hence 1 May.⁷

49. *P.Sakaon* 69 = *P.Stras.* I 43

This lease is dated to Tybi 19 in the consulate of Junius Bassus and Flavius Ablabius, and it is to run ἀπὸ τῆς ἤδη γενομένης ὑπ' ἐμοῦ σπορᾶς τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους πέμπτῃς ἰνδικτίονος. Preisigke took the view that the mention of a fifth indiction pointed to a date in 332, while the consular date is to 14.i.331. Of these Preisigke preferred the consular date to 331. In *CSBE* 50, 110 a.332, we supposed that the consulate was an error for post-consulate and that the indiction should be followed; we thus dated the text to 15.i.332. The most recent editor, Parássoglou, dates to 331.

A reconsideration persuades us that the conflict is not real, and that the indiction is compatible with a date in 331. We have argued elsewhere⁸ that σπορά and σπόρος commonly refer to the crop, and that the indiction numbers attached to them refer to the indiction of taxes declared for the crop in question, not the indiction period during which the planting took place. The fifth indiction was 331/2, and its harvest took place in early summer, 331; the crop already growing in January 331 is the crop harvested in May and June 331. The correct date is therefore 14.i.331 and all indices agree with this date.

50. *SB* I 4821

This papyrus figures on *CSBE* 119 as the sole example of the consulate of 464 in that year (there is one example of the postconsulate cited, *PSI* VII 768). The text as printed is rather curious, however, and we have obtained a photograph from the Louvre (where it is inventory number 6546 b W App. 685) thanks to the kindness of M.-F. Aubert. On it we find that Wessely's reading is utterly wrong, for where he reads 'Ρου]στικίου, the papyrus actually has]εστορίου, which we can only restore as Ν]εστορίου. Furthermore, after the month name there is no loss before the eta in line 3 which Wessely read, and one must read and restore Φαρμοῦθι³ | η τ[ρίτη]ς ἰνδικτίονος). It remains virtually certain, however, that we are dealing with the consuls of 464, as the Olybrii of 395 and 526 are put out of court by the third indiction, which began in 464 but not in or near either of the other

⁷ We take the opportunity to point out that Parássoglou's Ἀέλου Σακαῶνος in line 11 should actually be read as Πλουτάμμωνος.

⁸ See *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978) 287–93.

two years. Pharmouthi 8 of indiction 3 must be 3 April 465, in the post-consulate of these consuls.

Now the papyrus has virtually no margin at the top, and a photograph of the verso kindly provided by the Louvre shows that the papyrus was in fact broken off at top, so that there is every likelihood that some text has been lost. The first letter of the preserved line of the recto, read as upsilon by Wessely, can equally well be tau, and we think we see traces of an iota following it. Since about four letters seem lost in the lacuna before the nu, we consider τ[κίου Ν] a likely reading of the start of line 1. We would then restore the entirely lost first line of the original as [Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλαουίων Ῥουσ-]. The principal problem offered by our restoration is the presence of a name of Rusticius otherwise unknown to us, namely Nestorius. But very little is known about Rusticius in any case.

We take this opportunity of noting that in line 4 the space does not permit Wessely's restoration ἀπὸ [τῆσδε τῆς] Ἀρσινοειτῶν πόλεως, but indicates rather the more normal [τῆς] only. (The restoration of this papyrus proposed in *ZPE* 26 [1977] 278 is now replaced by the present note.)

51. *SB* III 7201

This Ghent papyrus, published originally in *Revue Belge de Philologie* 4 (1925) 649 no. 7, has a dating formula given by the editor as follows:

Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ[(ανίου)] Β[ελισαρίου τοῦ ?]
 [ἐνδοξοτ]άτο[υ] Παχῶν" .[" τῆς δευτέρας]
 [ἐνδ(ικτίονος)] τινος Ἱερημίου ἐκ μ[ητρὸς]

The mention of the second indiction as present in line 27 secures the number of the indiction, and the manifestly sixth-century character of the writing led the editor to the restoration of Fl. Belisarius as the consul, inspired, as he put it, by the postconsulate of Belisarius in *SB* III 6266 = 6704.⁹

It is perfectly possible that this date is correct. But it seems to us equally possible that one could restore the consul's name as Basilius, so that the date would be 553, also a second indiction. It might seem strange that (a) the regnal year of Justinian is not given at this date, and (b) the year of the postconsular era of Basilius (12 by normal reckoning) was not given. To the first of these one may cite *P. Lond.* V 1765, dated by consular year and presumably indiction (lost in line 2) to vi–vii.554; it is a Hermopolite text, and these follow the same formula as Antaiopolite in this reign. There is no

⁹ The editor's date is 537, but 23.i in indiction 1 falls in 538, and the text is so listed in *CSBE*.

regnal date. As to the second problem, an instance of the absence of the numeral can be found as late as 556, in *BGUI* 305. Finally, a postconsulate by Belisarius on 2.vi.538 (cf. below) would fall later than the date (15.iv) on which the new consulate of 538 is already attested in *P.Oxy.* XVI 1887.1. Our discussion in *CNBD* VI 63 (see below) leads us to the conclusion that such an overlap is not demonstrably found in any other year. The case for 553 is accordingly strengthened, and we take that to be the date.

It remains to add that on the plate in the original publication we read in line 2, Παῦ[ι] η τ[ῆς β ἰνδικ(τίονος)] (= 2.vi.553). Line 3, where no more than about 8 letters were lost, can thus hold adequately the nomen (presumably Aurelius) and the beginning of the name (Ἰουστίνος, e.g.) of the acknowledging party.

52. *SB* VI 9359 = *P.Lund* VI 10

The editor gives the consular date of this text as ὑπατ[είας Στελίχ]ωνος καὶ Αὐρηλιαν(οῦ) τῶν| λ[αμπροτάτων], i.e. A.D. 400. This seems correct, but one wonders why Stilicho, who is styled Flavius in his consulate of 405 (*SB* VIII 9931, cf. *CSBE* 116 s.a.405) lacks this name here. Consultation of the plate (pl. 3) in *P.Lund* VI and a comparison of lacunas in the following lines suggest that there is no real objection to inserting Φλ. into the restoration. In line 1, it should be noted, the plate suggests reading Αὐρηλιανοῦ, with a raised epsilon rather than a mark of abbreviation.

53. *SB* XII 11024

According to the editor's text (the papyrus was originally published in *Aegyptus* 50 [1970] 57) this fragment was dated by the consuls of 332, whose names, however, appear in an order reversed from what is normal (see *CSBE* 110 a.332 for the normal formula). All that is actually left on the papyrus, however, except for τῶ[ν λ]α[μπροτάτων] at the end, is]ο[υ Ἰ]λαριαν[ο]ῦ. The reversal of order of names in a papyrus coming from the consulate itself is otherwise unattested (cf. no. 46 above for a rather different phenomenon), and one may well be suspicious. On the plate in the original edition, we consider it possible to read Ἰα]ρ[ο]ναρι[α]νοῦ, which would allow us to restore the consuls of 328 in the proper order: Φλαουίου Ἰανουαρίνου καὶ Οὐεττίου Ἰούστου τῶν λαμπροτάτων. The superfluous alpha, converting an -inus name into -ianus, is paralleled by the conversion of Probinus into Probianus in *P.Flor.* I 17.19, of A.D. 341.

54. *PSI* I 86

In line 12 of this undertaking to be a surety for the performance of a liturgy, we find the basis of the liturgy defined as ὑπὲρ τῆς παρούσης ις"

φυλῆς. This curious locution led E. P. Wegener (cf. *BL* III 220) to propose that φυλῆς was an error of the scribe or the editor for ἰνδικ(τίονος). A photocopy kindly provided by R. Pinaudi shows that the editor's reading is correct (as Pinaudi has checked for us also on the original). From the name Σνεῦς (cf. *Cd'E* 49 [1974] 342 ff.) we suspect a Hermopolite provenance for the papyrus, and we do not know enough about the tribal system there to be certain if the phrase makes sense. If it does not, it is the scribe and not the editor who is at fault.

55. *PSI* IV 300

The editors of this papyrus proposed restoring the consular date in line 1 as follows: [Οὐαλερί]οις ὑπάτοις [τὸ τέ]ταρτον. They relied on *BGU* II 586, for which G. Plaumann had proposed a similar restoration. It was soon recognized that this restoration was incorrect, and that the consuls of A.D. 302 could not be referred to in this manner. Vitelli accordingly proposed [τοῖς ἀποδειχθησομέν]οις ὑπάτοις [τὸ τέ]ταρτον (*BL* I 395), with reference to the era of the Licinii. The date is correct, but in fact the formula used for the fourth year of this era in the Oxyrhynchite is in all cases [τοῖς ἐσομέν]οις ὑπάτοις [τὸ τέ]ταρτον, as this passage should be restored. (Sijpesteijn and Worp have already corrected *BGU* II 586 in *ZPE* 26 [1977] 267.) The correct date is thus 8.v.324.

56. *P.Stras.* 137

The period of this lease is defined as follows in the editor's text: πρὸς τὸ ἐνεστ[ὸς ...] ⁷ [.....] γκ[... ἔτο]ς. In *P.Stras.* IV, p. 184, it is suggested that in line 6 one read ἐνεστὸς ἔ[τος]?, and in line 7, τῆς ἰνδικτίω[νος]. This does not quite give us correct sense, as the number of the indiction is expected. The consular date in lines 19–21 shows that the date is 27.ix.325. The present indiction at this point (during the first cycle) is 14. We restore, therefore, [ιδS ἰν]δικτίω[νος] in line 7.

57. *P.Stras.* 580

This text is dated by the editor "VIe s. p.C." It does, however, have an exact date: p.c. Basilius year 12, Choiak 8, indiction 2. These indices give a date of 4.xii.553, and the papyrus is so listed in *CSBE* 124 a. 553.

58. *M.Chrest.* 196

This text is dated by the consuls of 309 (and is so entered in *CSBE*). The month and day were read by the editor as follows: πρὸς Νωνῶν Ἰου[. ἰω]ν. As it stood, therefore, it was not clear whether June or July was in question. In fact, however, there was no ante 6 Non. Iun. (ante 4 being

the first day after the Calends), while there was an ante 6 Non. Iul. We therefore regard it as clear that the restoration of 'Ιου[λίω]ν is to be preferred, and the date of the papyrus is 2.vii.309.

59. Pack² 2731

Under this number, R. A. Pack lists a set of six wooden tablets containing two iambic trimeters and the story of Agamemnon and Iphigeneia. The most recent edition is to be found in E. Ziebarth, *Aus der antiken Schule*² (Bonn 1913) under no. 17 (cf. G. Zalateo, "Papiri Scholastici," *Aegyptus* 41 [1961] 186, no. 189).

Undoubtedly the tablets (now kept in the Musée du Château Borelly, Marseille) came from Egypt (cf. the introduction to Ziebarth, no. 17a). The story of Agamemnon and Iphigeneia is preceded by a note which is printed by Ziebarth, no. 17b, as follows:

- 1 Αὐρήλιος Θεόδωρος Ἀνουβίωνος ἔγραψα τῇ καθ' ἡμέρᾳ ἡλίου
- 2 ὑπατείας Φλαουείου Κωνσταντίου καὶ Οὐαλ[ερίου Μαξιμιανοῦ
Καيسάρω]ν τῶν ἐπάρχων.

After the Agamemnon and Iphigeneia story one reads in line 7, *μηνὸς Φαρμουῦθι, ἡμέρᾳ ἡλίου*. The second line printed above is also given by Wessely, *MPER* II (1887) 29, who prints *Κωνσταντίνου*. Wessely dates the text to 21.iv.294; Zalateo adopts a more cautious line and gives the date as 294–306.

Now it is striking that the formula as restored does not resemble any of the known formulas for the consuls of 294 (see *CSBE* 104 a.294). Also the formulas of 300, 302, 305 and 306 (consulates of Constantius and Maximianus jointly) are in no way comparable.

One should therefore look for an alternative, and this can easily be found in the year 327, the joint consulate of Flavius Constantius and Valerius Maximus (cf. *CSBE* 109 a.327). In the second line printed above one should restore — — — Οὐαλ[ερίου Μαξίμου τῶν λαμπρο]τάτων ἐπάρχων. Professor P. Mertens has very kindly verified this reading for us on a photograph of the tablet obtained from the Château Borelly. If one compares lines 1 and 7, one gets the month and the day on which Aurelius Theodoros, son of Anoubion, made his school exercise, i.e. Pharmouthi 29, on a Sunday. Professor Mertens has verified the numeral.

Now Pharmouthi 29 = 24 April. With the help of the tables of V. Grumel, *La Chronologie* 316, one can see that 24 April 327 fell on a Monday; the pupil mistook either date or day of the week (unless Grumel's hypothetical tables do not correspond to the reckoning actually in use in Egypt in this period).

60. *Collection Froehner* 81

This inscription from Nubia is discussed in *CSBE* 49 n. 24; the numeral giving the number of hundreds in the date by the era of the martyrs is difficult to interpret. The month date which follows is also curious: it reads *σελλενι ιθ Χοί^κ π^τρ αναπανσο^ο*, which is interpreted by L. Robert as *σελήνη ιθ Χοί(α)κ π(ά)τ(ε)ρ ανάπανσο(ν)*. One is struck by the absence of a day number with Choiak; and equally the method of abbreviating *πάτερ* seems different from that employed in *μα^τρ* for *μαρτ(ύρων)*, for example. In fact, the formula does not require any vocative noun before *ανάπανσον*: cf. e.g. J. Kubinska, *Faras* IV (Warsaw 1974) 42 no. 9, line 22; 44 no. 10, line 27; 48 no. 13, line 8; 52 no. II, line 26. It seems, then, that one is justified in resolving *πρ(ώ)τ(η)*, giving us the date (Choiak 1).

61. *Lefebvre* 663

This inscription from Nubia has a date *Φαμενώθ ια ήμέρα γ' επί τὰς ζ ήμέρας κατὰ σελήνη κς εν/ ενεργνη qθ*. Lefebvre explains what follows the “selene” date: “Peut-être *εν(αι) εν ειρήνη* (Millet).” V. Grumel (*Byzantion* 35 [1965] 83–85), in discussing this text and trying to elucidate its date, ignores these words. But it is clear that what is lacking here is the indiction number, and one has only to divide *εν/* and resolve *εν(δικτίονος)* to supply that lack, make perfect sense of the text, and follow normal patterns. It may be noted that neither of the years (943 and 1122) suggested by Grumel for this inscription is compatible with a fifth indiction, and both may therefore be discarded.¹⁰

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

ROGER S. BAGNALL
K. A. WORP

¹⁰ Cf. Grumel, *La Chronologie* 229–30, for a different attempt on this text. There is nothing very astonishing about the failure of his method, for the dates were based on the “selene” dates; we cannot go into a full discussion here of the use of this type of dating, but we may note that of Grumel’s attempts in the *Byzantion* article to use it to date otherwise undatable texts, three fail completely to provide any solution, and two others succeed only by circular reasoning or choosing a calendar to fit the answer. No more persuasive are the treatments by M. Chaine, *Chronologie des temps chrétiennes* 190–91 and *JSOR* 10 (1926) 295. The text is republished by M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca* 4 (Rome 1978) 459 (no improvement on the date).